DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 785 LI 003 055

AUTHOR Crusz, Rienz W. G.

TITLE Organization and Management of Government Documents: An Investigation With Special Reference to the University of Waterloo Libraries.

INSTITUTION Waterloo Univ. (Ontario). Dana Porter Arts Library.

PUB DATE 9 Oct 69

NOTE 47p.; (50 References)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Foreign Countries; *Government Publications; *Library Collections; Library Services; *University Libraries; Use Studies

IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

A study was made on a reorganization of the holdings of government documents in the University into a separate collection. On the basis of evidence presented in the course of the study, depository status for all Canadian Federal Documents for the library, and a separate documents division to control and service them was recommended. The arguments were more related to the logic of future developments, rather than the existing conditions that prevailed. If the use and size of government documents could be stabilized at present levels, then the expertise of a documents librarian, without the device of separation, should prove sufficient. The evidence from projections, however, was more than compelling, and even if some element of speculation in these projections was accepted, broad trends of academic development on the campus have been irrevocably set. To this extent, the development and control of government documents on the lines recommended seem inevitable. (Author/AB)

ED054785

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS: AN INVESTIGATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO LIBRARIES

by

Rienzi W.G. Crusz

LI 003 055

Reference Department,
Dana Porter Arts Library,
University of Waterloo,
October 9, 1969.

CONTENTS

I	Introduction	1
II	Methodology	3
III	Acquisitions Policy for Government Documents	4
IV	Defects of Our Present Policies	6
V	Views of Professional Staff	9
VI	Consultation of Experts	9
VII	Separate, Integrated, and Partially Integrated Collections: The Debate on Types of Organization for Government Documents	11
VIII	Evidence from our Questionnaire on Government Documents	24
IX	Evidence from a Study of Projections	26
X	Recommendations	29
XI	Conclusion	31
XII	Appendices	32
XIII	Bibliography	42

I Introduction

At the meeting of the Library Affairs Committee, University of Waterloo, held on 12 December, 1967, Prof. S.G. Clarke tabled a request on behalf of the Department of Economics, that the Library consider reorganizing all its holdings of government documents into a separate collection.

This study issues from this initial request, and its specific terms of reference were set out in a memo issued in late December 1968 by Miss Helen McKinnon, Head, Public Services, Arts Library: we were required to make "an in-depth study of the methods employed in the handling of government documents in various types of research libraries here and abroad".

The broad objectives of the study have been to define more precisely the major implications involved in a separation of government documents, and to provide an informed basis, both statistical and evaluative, on which the Sub-Committee on Government Documents[1], and the Library Administration, could reach some firm decisions on this matter.

On the basis of the evidence presented in the course of this study[2], and from a close study of all the variables involved in the situation and stage of development in which the University of Waterloo Library now finds itself, we would favour and recommend a separate collection of documents (with some suitable modifications).

---

[1]At the Library Affairs Group meeting held on December 12, 1967, the Chairman named a Sub-Committee to study in more detail the problems of government documents: J.E. Anderson, Mrs. C. Pawley, S.G. Clarke and R. Bean.

[2]We would especially refer to the evidence provided by our Questionnaire on Government Documents, the evidence issuing from the American studies made on this problem, and the compelling evidence issuing from our study of projections.

In making this recommendation, however, we would like to feel that we are rather suggesting a choice of options than definitive and dogmatic answers. So long as each university library has its own unique set of conditions, any standard and stereotyped organization for the control of government documents will continue to be debated fiercely and inconclusively. In most cases there is no "solution", since solution implies a finality inconsistent with an evolving program. Until we reach the millenium, where every document arrives complete with catalog card, we would do well to interpret our needs carefully, and adopt such methods as would best meet those needs.

II Methodology

In the preparation of this report the following approaches were used:

(a) A close survey was made of the library literature on the subject, with special reference to the findings of the Surveys carried out in the United States.[3]

(b) A detailed questionnaire was constructed and sent out to twenty-eight university libraries across Canada.

(c) Interviews were held with library representatives in the departments of economics, political science, history, and sociology. The opinions of science faculty representatives were polled separately by Miss Ada Berti, Head, Reference Department, E.M.S. Library.[4]

(d) Consultations were had with all Heads of Departments, and professional staff as of June, 1969.

(e) Correspondence was had with some experts in the field, which included Prof. Ronald Stavely, Morley School of Librarianship and Archives, University of London; Prof. Edith Jarvi, School of Library Science, University of Toronto; Edward P. Leavitt, formerly Principal Documents Librarian at Stanford University; George H. Caldwell, formerly Documents Librarian, University of Kansas Library, and now Head, Public Reference Section, Library of Congress.

---

[3]Cf. Jack Schultz's survey on Government Documents Collection in academic libraries for the University of Massachusetts, Amherts, 1965; University of Michigan Survey, 1964, and George Caldwell's survey for the University of Kansas, 1958.

[4]"The overall reaction of the group was mixed and those present felt that more information was needed before any decisions could be made". (Extract from Minutes, March 11, 1969)

III Acquisitions Policy for Government Documents

Since there is a definitive correlation between methods of management and size of collections[5], it is more logical to first inquire into the status of our acquisitions policy as regards government documents. So far, the library has acquired a select amount of Canadian Federal Documents, and continues to receive these by a regular checking of the Daily Lists of the Queen's Printer. Provincial documents have trickled in, and there has not been any systematic acquisition of these documents. In the absence of official check-lists, especially for Ontario, much valuable material has escaped our attention. U.S. Federal Publications have also come in small quantitites, although recently a systematic checking of the Superintendent of Government Documents Lists is being done. Government publications from other foreign countries, and the important field of U.N. documents have also been acquired on an ad hoc and casual basis. If our acquisition of government documents is going to remain at this level, then there is little justification for the separation of all government documents. Without any basic changes, we might emphasize the importance of a more efficient "servicing" of these documents, perhaps with the help of a trained government documentalist.

---

[5]Both the Caldwell Survey and our own have established this conclusion beyond any doubt. Expert opinion of documents librarians also, supports this view. Cf. also Robert B. Downs' views: "... Perhaps the most common plan is to maintain them as a separate collection, with a specialist in charge... [This] plan is the most economical to administer"; Downs' Resources of Canadian Academic and Research Libraries, p. 71. Some librarians seriously question the economics of this argument, but there is little doubt, on an overall basis, that the big collection lends itself better to more effective control by separation.

However, in view of the future development of the academic programs in the social sciences, and from our study of projections on the University of Waterloo[6], we recommend some basic changes in our acquisition policies for government documents:

(i) That the University of Waterloo Library make arrangements to request for depository status for all Canadian Federal Documents.

(ii) That a systematic acquisitions program for all important Provincial documents, both current and retrospective, be centralized in the hands of a Documents Librarian.

(iii) That a broader selection of British material be bought on a continuing basis, with a longer program for retrospective buying.

(iv) That a study be made of all U.N. Documentation, including the specialized agencies, and arrangements be made in consultation with the faculties to acquire depository status for a select group of these documents.

(v) In order that the area of government documents material be clearly delimited, some definition of what constitutes a "government document" should be agreed upon. If there is to be a separate collection, would this also include all "government documents" issuing from other than the Canadian Federal and Provincial governments? Is the collection only to consist of "government documents," or will all "documents" as broadly interpreted and defined by the University of Guelph Documentation Centre fall into this classification? We suggest that a special sub-committee be appointed to study and report on this small but important area.

(iv) The same committee should also be assigned to formulate and write a policy statement on the acquisitions of government documents in the University of Waterloo libraries.

---

[6] Cf. Brief of the University of Waterloo delivered to the Committee on University Affairs, Oct. 8, 1968, and T.L. Batke, A Review of the University's Growth and Some Academic Planning Considerations for the Future.

With regard to our recommendation for depository status as regards Canadian Federal Documents, all faculty representatives in the Arts Group urged a separate collection[7] on the assumption that we intended to ask for depository status. When the important implications of such an assumption were pointed out to them, they continued to urge this policy unanimously. Many of them went even further by urging a complete acquisitions program for all Provincial Documents, especially one for the Province of Ontario. It is necessary here to remind ourselves that there is no magic in becoming a depository library; its value could only be effective, if adequate space, trained personnel, intense "servicing" of material, and sufficient funds are available. In the absence of any one of these requirements, a depository collection could easily become a limbo of forgotten material, and an expensive and wasted investment.

IV Defects of our Present Policies

(a) It has already been pointed out that, from the point of view of acquisitions, much valuable government material is now escaping our notice due to the absence of a centralized acquisitions program. The lack of Provincial checklists have added to the difficulty. The undivided attention of a trained documents librarian could have done much to improve the situation.

(b) Documents acquisition is not moving in sympathy with the rapid development of graduate programs in the social sciences. Projection studies would seem to indicate that a depository collection is now an inevitable development in our growth of materials. (cf. also, our section on Projection Studies)

---

[7]"Faculty present felt that although some of their colleagues were not 'roaringly in favour' of a separate collection, none was opposed." (Extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee on Government Documents held on February 27, 1969)

(c) Assuming, however, that our present materials are sufficient to meet our present needs, we observe some serious drawbacks in the handling of government material in the library. Government material is more difficult to catalog, and this has resulted in undue delays in the processing of this material.[8] Government documents are usually last in a cataloger's priorities; faculty are usually more concerned with the processing of books ordered by them than government material that comes in free. There is generally a disproportionate amount of time spent on ephemeral material, due to cataloguing difficulties, which sometimes results in the expenditure of about three dollars worth of professional time for a 25 ct. document. The virtues of an integrated collection, which claims that all documents are catalogued, are somewhat less persuasive when current government documents, especially in the field of political science, are not in the catalog within three months.

(d) There was unanimous agreement among faculty representatives that the most serious drawback in the present situation was the difficulty in finding the material. This of course is the old argument, and to our mind and that of many experienced reference librarians a valid one, that a catalog of government materials does not readily solve the problem of access. The intricacies of corporate headings, together with the frequent change of departmental names,

---

[8]Miss Jan Schmidt, Head, Serials Department, recognized the present delays, but said that within three weeks, the existing backlog could be processed. Mrs. Carolyn Pawley, Head, Cataloguing Department, indicated that cataloguing delays for government documents were always present, but could not provide any statistics on this problem. We feel that with the inflow of a greater number of documents, the situation as regards processing is bound to worsen.

provides too much of a burden on the average user of the catalog. In this connection Leon Carnovsky remarked: "...So complex has the modern library become, especially in the large library, that one may be permitted to question how efficiently it actually functions at the hands of a patron uninitiated into its more recondite aspects... . The assumption that the more complete the catalog and the greater number and variety of entries the better the catalog for all purposes is one which deserves some honest questioning".[9] Caldwell's careful study at the University of Kansas in 1960 sounded a similar warning: "in spite of the oft-expressed desire to treat government publications like any other publications, and the desire for single catalogs and unified collections, there are likely strong practical reasons which cause so many of these research libraries to give their documents special treatment".[10] So far there has been an undue emphasis upon the cataloguing of documents rather than providing experienced documents service to the public. With the increased use of documents in recent years, and the complexities involved in using them, it would seem that the time has arrived to shift our points of emphasis.[11]

---

[9]Leon Carnovsky, "Why Graduate Study in Librarianship," Library Quarterly, VII (1957), 251.

[10]George Caldwell, "University Libraries and Government Publications: A Survey", College and Research Libraries, XXII (1961), 30-34.

[11]Mahala Saville, "Government Publications - What Shall we Do With Them?", Library Journal, LXV (1940), 683.

V Views of Professional Staff

In the course of this investigation, we polled the opinions of about sixteen professional librarians (as of 30 June, 1969). We had a vote of about 87% of the staff interviewed in favour of a separate collection, given the necessary conditions. These include Head of Serials, Head, Cataloguing Department, Head, Public Services, Arts Library. Nearly all reference librarians were in favour of a separate collection. Miss Belle Grant, retired Head, Reference Department, was strongly opposed, and refused to envisage a situation where a documents collection depended entirely on the health of the documents librarian. Elsewhere in this report we have dealt with these objections. Mrs. Doris Lewis urged a very careful decision as regards depository status, and expressed valid arguments as regards the dangers of trying to operate a depository collection, without a full and careful investigation of the other factors involved. Miss Ada Berti, Head, Reference Department, E.M.S. Library, expressed no serious objections to separation, provided all science material continues to be located in the E.M.S. Library. Science faculty representatives would seem to feel like-wise. So long as there is centralized processing and receipt of government documents, we cannot see any objections to this measure of decentralization.

VI Consultation of Experts

In addition to the feed-back we received from experienced documents librarians in Canada through our questionnaire on government documents, we also sought and received advice from some American experts. We would like here to quote extracts from correspondence we have had among others with Mrs. Marion Howey, Documents Librarian, University of Kansas Libraries; George H. Caldwell, Head, Public Reference Section, Library of Congress, and Ernest P. Leavitt, formerly Principal Documents Librarian at Stanford University.

Marion Howey: "We are just now in the process of bringing together all of the government documents into one central area, and I personally believe that this is the best treatment of such a complex collection... . I personally visited the University of Colorado, at Boulder, and found a complete separate department working extremely well, to the satisfaction of the faculty and students".

Edward P. Leavitt: "I still think the consensus of opinion is that it is far less expensive to have a separate documents collection in place of attempting to classify and catalog them into a general collection. Tufts has a new university library building (opened in 1966) and created a new separate Documents Library in it".

George H. Caldwell: "I have become more convinced as time passed and experience accrued that a separate collection of government publications is preferable to complete dispersal - if not a totally complete collection (which encounters practical problems) at least a partial one. Government publications would be easier to find and use at the Library of Congress if they were more segregated, a course which I have advocated here. At the A.L.A. Convention in Kansas City last summer, I attended a small meeting (30-40 people) in which the primary topic was organization of documents collections... . The general consensus was that a separate collection is preferable for most types of government publications, if a library has enough to warrant this. I think it is especially important in a research library to make documents more accessible for serious research by faculty, graduate students, and others. At the University of Kansas, the main pressure to establish a separate collection came primarily from the faculty, especially the Political Science Department, who were prime users of the material".

VII Separate, Integrated, and Partially Integrated Collections: The Debate on Types of Organization for Government Documents

In our introductory remarks we mentioned our recommendation in favour of a separate collection, but disassociated ourselves with the giving of dogmatic answers; methods of organization for government documents have been so widely and inconclusively debated by library administrators, that it is useful to summarize the debate that is still going on. This restatement would no doubt provide irksome reading to professional librarians, and add to the length of this report, but we feel there is some real virtue in fully exposing, especially to faculty members on the Sub-Committee on Government Documents, the full library implications of alternative schemes. Besides, a full awareness of all the options open to us should help in making more objective decisions, and reduce the possibility of any special pleading for a separate collection.

Integrated Collection: Arguments in Favour

An integrated or distributed collection is one in which government publications are treated like any other type of publication and distributed throughout the general stacks of the library by subject.

1. Material on the same subject together on stacks.

   This is one of the strongest arguments for an integrated collection. It is no doubt convenient to be able to go to one place in the stacks, and find a complete collection of materials on one subject, including government documents. If there are other locations for library material on a subject, a student might overlook these resources, or may have to do some considerable running around to locate everything. On the other hand, it is impossible to have absolutely everything in the library on a subject cheek by jowl on the shelves. To do this, it would be neccessary to

cut up all serials, collections of essays, encyclopedias, etc., classify the segments, and place them alongside the books. By the same token, microfilms, rare books, reference pamphlet material, could not stand in separate locations.

2. All publications in one catalog.

This is a strong argument. It would be convenient to have every single document in the library system listed in one central catalog. Few libraries have achieved this. Many omit cataloguing of documents out of sheer necessity. Further, many readers cannot cope with the complexities and intricacies of corporate headings, which is common to the cataloguing of government documents. There are also the delays in cataloguing government materials, which tend to reduce its effectiveness for subject areas such as political science. It has been argued that the reader would be penalized if the card catalog did not show all the publications in the library. But as Isabel Jackson points out the reader will be penalized anyway if he relies completely on the general catalog for the last word on any subject. It cannot be as up-to-date or comprehensive as the variety of official indexes that exist. The desire to make the card catalog simple and all-inclusive so that undergraduates can find all the material they need without too much trouble, poses some fundamental questions. What kind of library are we trying to build? A library for sophomores or a library for serious research? It is easy to over-romanticize the undergraduates in attempting to meet their assumed demands. Many use the catalog very little. A serious undergraduate should learn to work with other bibliographic tools.

3. Most libraries satisfied.

In Isabel Jackson's 1950 survey of West Coast depository libraries, nine of the ten who said they classified government publications by Dewey or LC rated their arrangement adequate. Only one said it was wholly inadequate. In the Caldwell survey, of 1958, of the six libraries that had integrated collections, all seemed more or less satisfied.

4. Saves time of reference staff.

It has been argued that reference librarians lose less time looking for materials to help readers when everything is under one classification system and in one card catalog. This is true, so far as it goes. But it assumes that most of our reference service is to be given by a general reference staff. There is no doubt that a separate documents collection makes it possible to supplement general reference service with a quicker and more expert specialized service in the difficult area of government documents.

5. Greater use of documents?

It has been pointed out that if documents are located with other general material, there will be a greater use of materials by students and reference librarians. In a big collection of government documents, where some documents are not catalogued or analyzed, there is a tendency for this type of material to be little used. With a separate collection, however, users are forced to rely on government indexes, and have the ready assistance of a documents librarian. Thus readers will learn more about many publications which either do not show up in the main catalog, or whose content value is not truly reflected in the catalog. There is little doubt that when complete exposure to the full range of government documentation in one place is made, students or faculty are bound to find the encounter much more effective.

6. The integrated collection is best suited for small libraries or selective depositories.
This is a widely accepted argument. Our arguments for a separate collection have been determined on the assumption that sooner or later we will seek and get depository status, and that this development is almost inevitable.

Integrated Collection: Arguments Against

1. Government documents material is difficult to handle.
Documents are generally a type of material that is not easy to handle under the library's regular processing routines. Author entries are generally more complex, and many publications are non-book material such as serials and pamphlets. The maintenance of loose-leaf material, and flimsy pamphlets require special handling and attention. They also present the very real problem of volume: it has been estimated that since 1900, about 1,000,000 U.S. documents have been published, and that additions at the rate of 20,000 pour off the presses each year.
2. Inadequacy of coverage in catalog.
It is practically impossible for any library to catalog every single document that comes in on a "depository basis". Due to the lack of analytics, even cataloged material may not often reflect the content value of the documents available.
3. Documents hard to find.
We have remarked elsewhere that faculty representatives on the Arts group complained unanimously that their most serious difficulty as regards documents was in trying to find them. George Caldwell, from a questionnaire he addressed to undergraduates at Kansas University, mentions the fact that the commonest complaint was that documents were difficult

to find. At the time, Kansas had an integrated collection. The simple reason for these difficulties is that the special complexities of government publications often make them hard to find in a library which simply treats them like other publications.

4. Expense of cataloguing.
Because of the vast amount of material, and the special problems they present as regards entries, physical make-up of documents, etc., they are more expensive to process. Many documents are only small and ephemeral pamphlets, and require special binders before they can be shelved with the general collection.

5. Burden on catalogers.
Due to the special cataloguing problems connected with documents, catalogers tend to place them last in their scale of priorities. If the inflow of material is large, which it will be as an outcome of documentary status, the burden on catalogers is bound to be very heavy. Further, it is hard to rationalize the expenditure of so much time in establishing headings etc., when the documents often range from 25-50 cents in value.

6. Size of catalog.
If full cataloguing is done for government documents, the catalog is bound to grow at an uncontrolled rate, turning it into a rather cumbersome and unwieldy tool. We can hardly envisage a depository collection having complete and full cataloguing. A separate collection, on the other hand, would at most require the simple device of a shelf-list and would avoid thousands of catalog cards from encumbering the main catalog.

7. Delay in cataloguing and shelving documents.
Many documents, due to volume and complexity, together with the large cataloguing workload, tend to be slow in reaching the shelves and the card catalog. In contrast, many libraries having separate collections are able to show their documents on the shelves within forty-eight hours.

8. Scatters inter-related material.
When material is dispersed throughout the shelves, there is often the scattering of inter-related material. This is particularly true of statistical material.

9. Acquisition of documents neglected.
In the absence of a separate Documents Department, little attention is paid to a comprehensive and systematic acquisition of government documents. This is true of our own library situation. Even with depository status, important documents, especially in provincial and municipal areas, could easily be missed, unless special attention is given by library staff.

Separate Collection: Arguments in Favour

1. Higher quality of bibliographic service.
Sixty-five per cent of the libraries listed on the Caldwell survey[12] believed a separate collection produced a higher quality of bibliographic service. Our own survey revealed that out of the twenty-three libraries who answered our question on the quality of bibliographic service in separate collections (question 8) fifteen answered in the affirmative, while only two indicated inferior service. The verdict carries special weight, for the reason that most

---

[12]George Caldwell, op. cit., 30.

of the librarians answering the questionnaire were either documents librarians or reference librarians who work closely with documents and know their problems first hand.

2. Experience of libraries which had known both systems.
Evidence from those librarians who had worked both systems seems to come out in favour of separation.[13] For example, Iowa University's documents librarian said that they were originally compelled by space shortages to house their documents separately in another building. Their experience with this arrangement was so satisfactory that they continued to keep their documents separate even after they were able to move them into a more spacious building.

3. Separate collection is easier to use.
It is often easier to go directly from the Monthly Catalog to the shelf, via a Superintendent of Documents classification number, rather than struggle with the card catalog arranged according to LC. Also, in a separate collection, all documents are in one place, and one needs to go to one place to find them. There is a high degree of relationship between government publications, and reference is much easier when they are together.

4. Familiarizes users with government indexes.
Since access to government publications is usually through printed indexes, readers are obliged to learn the use of these indexes, and are thus introduced to important research tools and a wide range of materials they would hardly know if they relied primarily on the card catalog.

5. Forces readers to rely on skilled help.
A separate collection, with its special organization, also forces readers to turn to the documents librarian when they first begin using it, and thus exposes them to the expertise of a trained librarian. Under the regular system of card

---

[13] Ibid., 32.

catalogs and Dewey or LC classification, many students are more likely to work entirely on the basis of their own limited knowledge.

6. Expert staff and efficient service.

With a separate collection, there is a greater opportunity for specialization. Having the documents collection at hand makes it much easier for documents librarians to consult it and become familiar with it. By handling all phases of documents work - reference, acquisition, and cataloguing, the documents librarian learns much of the intricacies of transfers, mergers, discontinued series, etc. and is thus able to identify obscure items.

7. Better control over pamphlet and ephemeral material.

Pamphlet and ephemeral material is a difficult type of material to handle. Libraries seldom catalog and classify this material, and they tend to be hidden in a number of pamphlet files. It has been estimated that about 50% of U.S. government publications are pamphlets. Thorough coverage is given in government indexes, and a separate collection therefore makes possible a much better access to, and control over this difficult breed of material. Where in a regular system of control, pamphlet material would perhaps be given discriminatory treatment, in a separate collection all documents are equally exposed and accessible to the reader.

One of the strongest arguments is that documents are generally available to the reader within forty-eight hours, if not earlier. In disciplines such as political science, it is almost true to say that a document that is not on the shelf on time is as good as not being there at all.

8. Aids cataloguing.
   A separate collection can rely heavily on available indexes, and operate efficiently on a simple set of records. Time spent in the cataloguing department choosing classification numbers, unravelling complicated series and sub-series etc. could all be avoided.
9. A saving on processing costs.
   A separate collection also involves a saving on cataloguing costs. Most of the difficult cataloguing has already been done, in the official catalogs, and binding expenses for pamphlets and other ephemeral material could be reduced.
10. Easier housing.
    A separate collection provides better and more organized facilities for the handling of pamphlets etc.
11. A greater awareness of documents.
    With a separate collection, users are more conscious of a major source of information besides regular books and serials.
12. Greater use of documents.
    Students who are required to use documents in the course of their work are likely to use a separate collection much more extensively than when the documents are dispersed among the general collection. Isabel Jackson is one expert who believes this to be true.

Separate Collection: Arguments Against

1. Material on any one subject tends to be broken up.
   The arguments cited earlier in favour of a distributed collection covers this argument fairly well.
2. Artificial division of materials.
   It has been argued that the accident of imprint is insufficient reason to treat a government publication any different from

others. Format is of little consequence. On the other hand, it is the very difficulties of format which create some serious problems for researchers. Also, we already have the precedent of rare books being kept separate on the grounds of format and handling needs.

3. Everything not in central catalog.
   This problem was discussed in the section on the advantages of an integrated collection.
4. The need to learn the use of additional systems.
   In using a separate collection, there is a need to rely heavily on the indexing systems as used in government indexes. This, no doubt, involves an additional burden but the reader, especially faculty and graduate students, once taught the elements of the new system, quickly masters the various procedures. Many document librarians vouch for the absence of any serious problems in this regard.
5. Will the separate collection be overlooked?
   When documents are not on the regular shelves, and if they are separated and stacked in a rather inaccessible part of the library, there is a tendency for readers to miss the collection. This situation, however, could be improved by the use of numerous cross references in the main catalog, guide cards, exhibits, prominent mention in the library handbook, classroom directives, etc.
6. A problem for reference librarians.
   With a separate collection, general reference librarians may not know what is available there for general reference questions. This problem could perhaps be met effectively by having reference librarians spend some time daily in the documents room; full cooperation on the part of the documents librarian would also be beneficial.

7. Use of indexes time-consuming.
   It is sometimes time-consuming to search through official monthly indexes for materials required. Cumulation of indexes, however, tend to reduce this problem. This of course is no greater problem than searching through periodical indexes, which students use all the time. Also, a complex entry for a publication can often be more quickly located in an official index than in the main card catalog.
8. Students dislike the use of indexes.
   This is true, but mostly at the initial stages of his encounter with documents. Once a student has been taught the use of indexes, he has little trouble in working his way through documents.
9. Space requirements.
   Although in quantitative terms a separate collection does not need more space for documents, the space does need to be in one block. This is not always possible in libraries that have already heavy commitments as regards available space. A badly located separate collection is bound to have poor response from users.
10. The problem of cost.
    It has been contended by some librarians that whatever monies are saved on processing, are spent anyway on extra reference service. This is perhaps true. But the benefits of a special personalized service that one finds in a separately run collection more than justifies the cost.
11. Departmental libraries and duplication.
    It has been asserted that a separate collection is seldom complete, because many documents are required in other parts of the library. With a highly departmentalized library system there is always the tendency towards a decentralization of documents. However, even if a separate collection should give

up control of documents in the sciences and engineering, the balance material, especially in the social science group, could be more readily and easily handled under conditions of separation.

The Mixed Collection

Another type of organization for documents is the mixed arrangement, or what has often been called the "partially integrated" system. Here, some documents would be placed in the general library collection and catalogued; others would be kept in a separate collection.

Arguments in Favour

1. Advantages of each system.
   It claims to combine the advantages of an integrated collection with the economies of a separate collection. Important documents are catalogued, and the less important ones are serviced from the Documents desk.
2. Practical negative advantages.
   The mixed system has sometimes been described as a compromise between the ideal and the impossible. Circumstances have sometimes determined the adoption of this course. Caldwell cites the case of UCLA where its mixed arrangement was dictated by limitations of staff and space, and the existence of strong branch libraries.
3. User satisfaction.
   Both the Caldwell survey and our own questionnaire have indicated a fair proportion of those libraries that operated a mixed system were generally satisfied with their arrangements.

4. Easy separation of technical items.

In a limited mixed system, where a great deal of specific technical literature such as in the fields of mathematics, engineering, etc., could easily be separated, it has been shown that the balance of the separate collection could be managed quite efficiently.

Arguments Against

1. Confusion of readers.

Readers are often confused when some government publications are in a documents department and others are not. It is often difficult for them to remember which documents are in one place and which ones are located elsewhere. Caldwell indicates that this was one of the most serious complaints by faculty and students at the University of Kansas. Our own interviews with faculty representatives have also disclosed the problems created by a dispersal of documents.

2. Other arguments.

Ellen Jackson has pointed out some other important arguments: the use of distributed publications is lessened by separating them from the mass of supporting and related material to which many major government publications refer. If essential publications are placed in the main collection, the separate collection is weakened, and tends to become "a withered remnant". If funds allow, she feels it is better to duplicate material that one wishes to integrate with the general collection.

VIII Evidence from the Questionnaire on Government Documents

In June 1969, the Reference Department, University of Waterloo, addressed a detailed questionnaire on the organization and management of government documents collections to twenty-eight Canadian universities across the country.

On the assumption that we will obtain depository status to meet our future needs, and on the recognition that our present difficulties with documents as regards acquisition, cataloguing, and servicing are serious enough to need drastic organizational change, the evidence of our findings on the survey strongly supports the case for separation. A full statistical and evaluative analysis of the replies on our questionnaire is given in Appendix I and II of this report. We would, therefore, here mention only the highlights of our findings:

1. While an overwhelming mandate has not been given to keep all documents in a separate collection, there seems to be an increasing trend towards this arrangement among Canadian university libraries. Fourteen out of twenty-six reporting libraries had separate collections, with four others who would opt for separation, given choice and opportunity. This approximates to about 69% in favour of a separate collection.
2. Speed, economy, better service, profusion of materials, together with the expertise provided by trained documentalists, were some of the common reasons given by libraries in support of separate collections. It would appear that there is a definite correlation between size of collections and arrangement: libraries with small collections tended to integrate their material with the general collection, those with large collections (of government documents) generally treated them as separate.

3. Of the twenty-three libraries who replied to the question whether a separate collection tended to result in "higher bibliographic service", fifteen answered "yes", two said "no", one said "no great difference", and five answered "unable to determine".
4. All 17 libraries that answered question 14 of our questionnaire replied that they would prefer to see non-federal documents (U.S. and Canadian) in a separate collection, and in the same collection as federal documents.
5. Generally, separate collections seemed to be arranged in several different classification schemes, with heavy reliance on official indexes and numbering systems. To the question whether all documents were catalogued and classified in one classification scheme, five replied "yes", thirteen answered "no".
6. Despite the different methods used, only two libraries expressed dissatisfaction with its handling of government documents, and another indicated its scheme as "increasingly inadequate". This statistic would seem to indicate the importance of other factors of management other than the mere virtues of "separation" or "integration".
7. Fifteen libraries indicated that where a separate collection has no entries in the main catalog, this is a disadvantage, but is compensated for by the advantages of a separate collection. Seven libraries, however, considered this arrangment as a serious omission for undergraduates, graduates, and library staff.
8. Eleven libraries reported that they had only one professional librarian in charge of the separate collection, with at least one to two clerical hands for assistance. Most of these libraries had medium-sized collections.

9. The arrangement by Queen's Printer Scheme for Canadian Federal documents seemed to be fairly closely divided: twelve used it, nine did not. In the use of the Superintendent of Documents Scheme for U.S. Federal documents: eight used it, fourteen did not.
10. A fairly high percentage of reporting libraries (9-6) indicated that they arranged U.S. State and Municipal documents, Canada, Provincial and Municipal documents, and other foreign documents, alphabetically by government unit and agency.
11. Twelve libraries as against six, opted to arrange their collections of U.N. Documents according to U.N. Documents numbers.
12. A high proportion of libraries had their documents collections on the main floor, and in close proximity to the main catalog and Reference Area. Nearly all libraries indicated that given a choice, they would like to see the documents collection close to the Reference area.
13. Fourteen libraries provided special reading areas for government documents; eleven considered the space they had as sufficient for the purpose.
14. A fairly high proportion (11 libraries) estimated the use of government documents per day as being between 10-25 persons.
15. Fifteen libraries (as against four) preferred to have open stacks for their documents collection.

IX Evidence From a Study of Projections

1. Both the Caldwell survey and our own survey have indicated that there is a broad correlation between size of collection

and organizational structure. Those libraries that had big collections generally tended to separate, those with small ones integrated.

2. It has been already pointed out that if Waterloo's collection of government documents is tc remain somewhat stable at the present level, there is no real justification for a separate collection. Intensive servicing programs with the help of a government documents librarian would perhaps provide some solution.
3. Unfortunately we have no statistics at present to show the use of government documents. But from our conversation with faculty and students, and observations made from reference desk questions, it would appear that the use of government documents is on the increase. If , at the present level of our collections, we have serious complaints about the service in this area, it then logically follows, that if larger academic programs, and greater enrollment at this University is made, the service in this area is bound to break down. The evidence from the various studies on projected development for this university seem to indicate that both academic programs and enrollment are bound to increase rapidly. We have had at our disposal the following documents from which evidence has been extracted:

   (i) Brief of the University of Waterloo delivered to the Committee on University Affairs, Oct. 8, 1968.

   (ii) T.L. Batke, A Review of the University's Growth and Some Academic Planning Considerations for the Future.

   (iii) Report of the Registrar to the Senate and Board of Governors, December 1, 1968.

   (iv) Tenth Anniversary, 1957-1967, University of Waterloo. (Statistical brochure)

T.L. Batke, "By the fall of 1963... the University attempted to define the general concept of expansion beyond the "south campus" phase so that the 1962 plan could be appropriately modified.

Expansion to a range of 14,000 - 16,000 was contemplated "beyond 1970" by establishing one or two sub-campuses ("north" and "west") each of which could accomodate say 2,000 - 4,000 students in Arts and Science and function as largely independent academic units...

...The resulting growth plan, shown as Appendix V (of the Batke report) has the following features:

-Three relatively self-contained sub-campuses, each of which could be developed to some ultimate capacity of 8,000 - 10,000 for a total of 25,000 - 30,000 students

-a "super-centre" for the whole complex containing a variety of central services, e.g. large concert hall, main research library, administration building".[14]

The University of Waterloo Brief to the Committee on University Affairs indicates among other things, "expected development, in the early '70's, of graduate courses in Optometry and the development of an Institute for Science Education...

...In the School of Physical Education and Recreation, graduate work at the Masters level is expected to start in Kinesiology in 1973-74, and Recreation in 1974-75".[15]

"The Faculty of Arts expects to develop a Masters programme in Economics in 1970, a Ph.D. programme in History in 1972, and a Ph.D. programme in Political Science."[16]

The possibilities of having faculties for law and medicine are not altogether speculative, and the Brief makes the very significant

---

[14] T.L. Batke, A Review of the University's Growth and Some Academic Planning Considerations For the Future (Waterloo, Ontario, 1965), p. 6.

[15] Brief of the University of Waterloo delivered to the Committee on University Affairs, October 8, 1968 (Waterloo, Ontario, 1968), p. 13.

[16] Ibid., 13.

remark that "since the University of Waterloo is one of the few institutions with a large amount of inexpensive and uncommitted land...there may be programmes which you want this institution to offer. For example, you may determine that this University needs to offer Medicine...in the next 10 to 15 years."[17]

In view of the trends in development that are indicated by the above evidence, we find sufficient justification for pursuing the matter of depository status for all Canadian Federal documents, and organizing our collection into a separate documentation centre.

X Recommendations

1. Since we place the highest priority for the "servicing" of government documents, we recommend the early appointment of a documents librarian. Full and undivided attention on the part of a professional librarian should do much to improve an area which has been somewhat neglected so far. If a decision to have a separate collection is finally approved, the preliminary work of a documents librarian would be necessary for the massive and intricate work of separation. Even if we decide to continue with an integrated collection, a documents librarian would be most helpful in providing a systematic and organized acquisitions and reference programme.
2. We suggest that the library administration, in consultation with faculty, define fully our status as regards the acquisition of government documents. The evidence of this study fully supports the need for a depository collection.
3. A special sub-committee should be appointed to work out a definition for government documents (for the sake of inclusion or exclusion). This same committee should also be assigned the task of formulating a written policy for documents acquisition.

---

[17] Ibid., 14.

4. On the assumption that our recommendation at 2 above is accepted, and in view of all the other factors surveyed, we feel that the most suitable arrangement for a depository collection is that of separation.
5. Since the University of Waterloo Library has already other schemes of automation underway, we would suggest that the Systems Librarian be requested to study the computerized programme of the University of Guelph and report on its feasibility for our own needs.
6. In order to avoid the possible dichotomy between the Reference Department and a separately administered collection of documents, we suggest that the Documents Division be administratively set up as a part of the Reference Department. Some system of having reference librarians spend a few hours per week in the documents centre should be evolved, so that no serious breakdown of service will occur in case of the absence of the documents librarian.
7. Such matters as cataloguing and indexing policies, records, circulation and reference service, processing and binding, are details which are not basic to the terms of reference of this report, and could be more readily worked out once basic decisions on this matter are made. Appendix I of this report, however, gives some picture of the practices prevailing in other Canadian libraries.
8. Since we find that science documents generally fall into a neatly classified segment, we have no objections to a measure of decentralization. E.M.S. documents could continue to be located in the E.M.S. Library, subject to a centralized acquisition and processing program at the Documents Division.
9. In the location of a separate Documents Division, we would urge the selection of an area contiguous to or near the Reference Department. Much of the value of a separate collection could be seriously diluted, if the collection is confined to some rather inaccessible public area.

Conclusion

On the basis of evidence presented in the course of this study, we have recommended depository status for all Canadian Federal Documents for this library, and a separate documents division to control and service them. Our arguments are more related to the logic of future developments, rather than the existing conditions that prevail. If the use and size of government documents could be stabilized at the present levels, then the expertise of a documents librarian, without the device of separation, should prove sufficient. The evidence from projections, however, is more than compelling, and even if we accept some element of speculation in these projections, there is no denying that the broad trends of academic development on this campus have been irrevocably set. To this extent, the development and control of government documents on the lines recommended by us would seem inevitable.

Rienzi W.G. Crusz,
Reference Department,
Dana Porter Arts Library,
University of Waterloo.

Appendix I

Statistical Report of Findings on the University of Waterloo's Questionnaire on Government Documents Collections, June 1969

No. of Questionnaires sent out: 28
No. of replies: 26
Percentage response: Approx.: 92 %

1. Arrangement of government publications in the library:
   (a) Integrated: 3
   (b) Separated: 14
   (c) Partially integrated: 9

   Of these, one "integrated" and three "partially integrated" libraries expressed a wish to have a totally separate collection. If we add these 4 libraries to the 14 libraries already operating their government documents on a separate basis, we would have 18 libraries which favour a separate collection. This is approx. 69 % of the vote.

2. Administration of government documents as:
   (a) Separate dept. or division: 9
   (b) Part of another department: 12

3. Only 2 libraries reported having a special documents cataloguer.

4. How satisfactory is your present system for handling government documents?
   (a) Extremely satisfactory 1
   (b) Adequate 16
   (c) Expensive 1
   (d) Lacking in flexibility 0
   (e) Wholly inadequate 3

5. Do you feel that a separate collection of goverment publications, in comparison with a collection in which they are integrated, tends to result in:
   (a) Higher quality of bibliographic service 15
   (b) Inferior quality of bibliographic service 2
   (c) No great difference 1
   (d) Unable to determine 5

6. If you had govt. publications on microform, how do you handle them?
   (a) Integrate them within the separate collection? 1
   (b) Keep them separately, but within the separate collection? 3
   (c) Include them in a totally separate audio-visual collection? 15

7. Some of the strongest arguments for placing govt. publications (e.g. U.S. Federal) in a separate collection are the existence of a well-organized system of printed catalogs and classification numbers, which makes it easier to handle and control the large volume of materials in depository collections. For most libraries, these conditions do not hold for other types of govt. publications: state, local, foreign and U.N. Do you still feel there are important reasons why these non-federal documents should be in a separate collection?

   Yes: 17
   No: nil

   If yes, is it important for them to be in the same collection as the Federal documents?

   Yes: 17
   No: nil

8. What are the responsibilities of the govt. documents department? Please check items listed below:

(a)	Selection	18
(b)	Gifts	14
(c)	Ordering	12
(d)	Payment	3
(e)	Order searching	11
(f)	Claiming	11
(g)	Bindery preparation	17
(h)	Cataloguing	11
(i)	Classifying	10
(j)	Records	15
(k)	Reference	18
(l)	Circulation	15
(m)	Shelving	19

9. What is the number of staff?
   (a) Professional
   (b) Clerical

   } Some variation according to size of collection; an average of <u>one</u> professional, and 2 clerical assistants for a medium-sized collection.

10. If govt. documents are kept in a separate collection, do you catalog and classify <u>all</u> documents in one classification?

    Yes: 5
    No: 13

11. Canada. Federal Publications.

(a) Do you arrange by Queen's Printer's Scheme? Yes: 12
No: 9

(b) Do you catalog and classify completely? 5
partially? 10

Among the schemes used were LC, Ellen Jackson, and Guelph University Scheme.

12. U.S. Federal Publications.

(a) Do you arrange by Superintendent of Documents Scheme? Yes: 9
No: 14

(b) Do you catalog and classify completely? 6
partially? 9

13. U.S. (State, Municipal)

(a) Do you arrange alphabetically by govt. unit and agency? Yes: 9
No: 4

(b) Do you catalog and classify completely? 6
partially? 5

14. Canada. (Provincial, Municipal)

(a) Do you arrange alphabetically by govt. unit and agency? Yes: 16
No: 3

(b) Do you catalog and classify completely? 3
partially? 9

15. Other Foreign Govt. Documents.

(a) Do you arrange alphabetically by country and agency? Yes: 14
No: 3

(b) Do you catalog and classify completely? 3
partially? 9

16. U.N. Documents.

(a) Do you arrange by U.N. Documents numbers? Yes: 12
No: 6

(b) If yes, why do you do so? 11
(i) Adequate indexing by UNDI: 7
(ii) To avoid cataloguing 13
(iii) Speed and economy 4

(c) Do you catalog and classify completely? 7
partially?

17. Other International Bodies (O.A.S., IMF, etc.)

(a)	Do you arrange alphabetically?	12
(b)	Do you catalog and classify completely?	4
	partially?	7

18. Vertical Files.

(a)	Do you maintain vertical files in the Department? Yes:	6
	No:	12

(b) What kinds of materials are included in these files?
Most libraries answered: ephemeral, and included catalogues in this collection.

(c)	Are they catalogued and classified completely?	nil
	partially?	3

19. How many patrons would you estimate use your government documents collection on the average?

(a)	Less than 10 per day	6
(b)	10-25 per day	11
(c)	Over 25 per day	2

20. In what area of the library is the separate documents collection located?

(a)	Main floor	7
(b)	One floor above main floor	3
(c)	One floor below main floor	3
(d)	Other	2

21. Near what service area?

(a)	Reference	10
(b)	Serials	4
(c)	Circulation	6
(c)	Social Sciences Area	1

22. Why was this area chosen?

(a)	Best space available	13
(b)	Available space nearest to:	
	1) General Reference	5
	2) Periodicals Room	nil
	3) Card Catalog	2
(c)	Government documents collection serviced by Reference Staff.	8

23. Where would you place the government documents collection if you had a choice?

(a) Near Reference Department	14
(b) Near Social Science	4
(c) Other	1

24. Accommodation of readers:

(a) Is there a separate reading area provided?	Yes:	14
	No:	4
(b) Is the amount of space sufficient?	Yes:	11
	No:	4
(c) Is there adequate work area for the Department?	Yes:	7
	No:	11

Appendix: II

Reasons Given by Some Canadian Universities for Policies of Separation, Integration, and Partial Integration, in the Management of Government Documents; Extracts from the Questionnaire on Government Documents, University of Waterloo, dated June 3, 1969.

SEPARATE COLLECTIONS

Brock University

1. Experimenting with the Guelph system.
2. Previous document collection was unorganized and very difficult of access.
3. Guelph scheme offers great potential and falls in line with automation policy of this library.

University of Toronto

1. Simple, easy to use and understand.
2. Allows 95 %of all material received in the Government Publications Section to be on the shelf ready to use within 48 hours.

University of Saskatchewan (Regina)

1. Large cataloguing backlog in other areas.
2. Separate collection can be satisfactory, if the rest of the reference staff is aware of its resources, and if we have knowledgeable staff members to service it.

Dalhousie University

1. The need was found to use a shortened classification for documents.
2. This proved easier when the material was physically segregated as the entries do not always agree with L.C. which is being used for the main collection.
   - a separate classification system now being implemented has completed the segregation.

York University

1. If they are fully catalogued and classified, the number of documents acquired by York University could not possibly be processed quickly enough to meet the demand for them.

2. Use of government numbering systems and separate processing procedures help put the documents on the shelves rapidly.

3. Staff handling documents develop an expertise which allows them to provide a quick and reliable reference service.

Waterloo Lutheran University

We feel that much government document material does not conform well to the main collection.

McMaster University

1. Simplification of processing possible.

2. Belief that documents staff, knowing the publications, can give more effective reader service.

McGill University

1. It was felt that a specialized staff could give more extensive reference service to users of government documents.

2. Also, because of the increasing amount of publications put out by governments and the special problems they presented it was considered more efficient and economical to treat them separately.

University of New Brunswick

1. The main reason for having a separate collection is economic.

2. By using the documents tools an adequate approach can be made without complete cataloguing.

University of Alberta

1. The present system developed in the library as a consequence of rapidly expanding numbers of incoming government publications.

2. When the library obtained Federal depository status for Canadian Federal and later for U.N., a separate Documents Section was established.

University of Manitoba

1. Government catalogues and finding tools were already available.

2. There was a necessity for specially trained Documents staff.

University of Ottawa

1. Efficiency and Economy
   This seemed to us the most economical and yet efficient method of arranging government publications.

2. It makes ALL documents equally available, it minimizes expense, requires fewer and simplified records, uses classification schemes provided by government offices and has full benefit of government indexing services.

3. A better quality of bibliographic service can be given by the staff which is specially trained in the handling of government publications and is familiar with its many intricacies and peculiarities.

University of Saskatchewan (Saskatoon)

-number of documents involved
-the fact that they are to some extent self-arranging and are at least manageable without L.C. classification
-the fact that many references to them are specific (i.e. the user knows that it is a document he wants ... thus separate location
-connection with Reference because many information questions result in the use of government documents although this may not be known beforehand

Sir George Williams University

-as government publications arrive in great quantities (esp. parliamentary documents) it is the staff time factor for cataloguing department which determines in part our policy
-as publications of certain bodies have their own indexes, catalogues and classification schemes, this also determines in part our policy
-as government publications are a specialized type of material, it is felt that a higher quality of service can be rendered by staff trained in their use

University of British Columbia

Our collection of government publications is very large and it became necessary to organize them as separate division of the library in 1964.

University of Western Ontario

1. Government documents are kept in a separate collection because the great increase in the number of publications and the wide variety of subjects handled by government agencies have created problems in cataloguing and bibliographic control.

2. By segregating these publications, the library can use the official catalogue and indexes of each organization and thus make them more readily available and accessible.

INTEGRATED COLLECTION

Carleton University

1. The library has tended to stress subject content and ignore format.

2. Documents have always been ordered by subject specialists, and catalogued and classified for the subjects.

3. Also, the library has been reluctant to decentralize the collection in any way.

Victoria University (University of Toronto)

1. We select a relatively small number of government publications, which makes it impractical to use the government numbering system.

2. We have access on the campus to a large collection of government publications in the main library of University of Toronto, also to the collection in the nearby Legislative Library.

3. Because of the nature of our collection (publications selected for their subject content) it seems useful to locate these publications with other material on the same subjects.

4. In a fairly small library without a government documents librarian or a special documents cataloguer it is an advantage to have the material catalogued and classified in the same way as other material, and listed in the general catalogue.

Simon Fraser University (Integrated collection)

- to centralize information so that it will be readily accessible to the user

PARTIALLY INTEGRATED COLLECTION

Memorial University of Newfoundland Library

1. Kept separate because of easier processing.

2. Part of reference to give continuous service.

3. Some monographic material integrated for better access.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archer, John H. "Acquisition of Canadian Provincial Government Documents," Library Resources and Technical Services, V (Winter 1961) 53-59.

Armstrong, M. "Documents Librarian Has Share in Many Library Services," Library Journal, LXXIV (December 1949) 1789-1800.

Barr, William F. "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Superintendent of Documents Classification as a Key to a Depository Collection," College and Research Libraries (January 1951) 40 - 42.

Beckman, Margaret. "A Documentation Centre at the University of Guelph Library," Ontario Library Review, L (December 1966) 226-229.

Bertalan, F.J. "Selection and Reference Use [of Government Publications] in the Special Library," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 143- 156.

Boyd, Anne Morris. United States Government Publications. 3d ed. Rev. by R. Elizabeth Rips. New York: Wilson, 1949.

Cabeen, V.A. "Official Checklist and Indexes Versus Cataloguing of Government Publications: A Symposium; Foreign Government Publications," College and Research Libraries, XII (April 1951) 163-166.

Caldwell, George. "University Libraries and Government Publications: A Survey," College and Research Libraries, XXII (January 1961) 30-34.

Chamberlin, Waldo and Moor, Carol Carter. "The United Nations Documents Collection at New York University," College and Research Libraries, XII (1951) 52-61.

Clarke, N.F. "Cataloguing, Classification, and Storage of Government Publications When Incorporated Into the General Library Collection," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 58-71.

Downs, R.B. "Government Publications in American Libraries," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 178-194.

Eastin, R.B. "Let's Use Public Documents," Library Journal, LXXII (November 1, 1948) 1554-1558.

Ellsworth, R.E. "Colorado University's Divisional Reading Room Plan," College and Research Libraries, II (March 1941) 103-109.

Erickson, E.L. "Sessional Papers," Library Journal, LXXVIII (January 1953) 13-17.

Fisher, D.M. "Brief Note on Ontario Government Publications," Ontario Library Review, XXXVII (May 1953) 112-114.

Gouthreau, O. "Some Difficulties With Canadian Government Documents; One Librarian's Viewpoint," Ontario Library Review, XXXIV (February 1950) 71-74.

Hartas, J.C. "Government Scientific and Technical Reports and Their Problems," Assistant Librarian, LIX (3) (1966) 54-59.

Holdsworth, H. "An Arrangement for Government Publications," East African Library Association Bulletin (January 1962) 15-25.

Hope, J.A. "Government Publications - Will They Bite?" Wilson Library Bulletin, XXX (March 1956) 519-522.

Hull, Jeanne E. "Obligations and Staff Requirements of a Complete Federal Depository," College and Research Libraries, (January 1951) 37-38.

Humphrey, Mary Brown. "Obstacles and Opportunities in Specialized Treatment of Federal Depository Documents," College and Research Libraries (January 1951) 45-47.

Jackson, E. Administration of Government Documents Collections. [Chicago. Publications Committee of the Association of College and Reference Libraries, 1953] (ACRL Monograph, no. 5)

Jackson, E. A Brief Guide to Government Documents. University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science. Occasional Papers, no. 7 (February 1950)

Jackson, E. "Cataloguing, Classification, and Storage in a Separate Documents Collection," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 50-57.

Jackson, I.H. "Official Checklists and Indexes Versus Cataloguing of Government Publications: A Symposium; United States Federal Publications," College and Research Libraries, XII (April 1951) 159-160.

Kane, R. "The Future Lies Ahead: The Documents Depository Library of Tomorrow," Library Journal, XCII (November 1967) 3971-3973.

Leavitt, Edward P. "Government Publications in the University Library," Library Journal, LXXXVI (May 1, 1961) 1741-1743.

Low, Edmon. "Government Documents at Oklahoma A & M," Serial Slants, VII (January 1956) 16-25.

Lundy, Frank A. and Johnson, E.M. "Documents in the Divisional Library," College and Research Libraries, XIX (November 1958) 463-466.

MacBride, James H. "A Subject Approach to United Nations Documents," College and Research Libraries, XV (1954) 42-46.

Mahler, J.H. "Selection and Reference Use [of Government Publications] in the Public Library," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 93-106.

Marshallsay, D.M. "A Parliamentary Papers Library," Library World, LX (May 1959) 235-240.

Mason, Ellsworth. "U.S. Government Documents: a Symposium," Serial Slants, VII (January 1956) 5-35.

Michigan. University. Library. Summary of Response to Government Documents Questionnaire. [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 1964] Typewritten.

Moll, W. "Fresh Look at the Treatment of Documents," Library Resources and Technical Services, IV (Winter 1960) 43-44.

Murray, F.B. "Reference Use of Canadian Documents," Library Resources and Technical Services, V (Winter 1961) 48-52.

Oller, Kathryn, ed. "Government Publications," Drexel Library Quarterly, I (4) 1965. 58p.

Ontario Library Association. Ontario Resources and Technical Services Group. Facing Up to Government Publications. Report on a workshop held on October 28, 1967. (Processed) Includes the following papers:

1. Judith Doig, Integrating Government Documents.
2. Lucille Galloway, Facing Up to Government Publications.
3. Margaret Beckman, The Planning Stage of the Guelpn Documentation Centre.
4. Lan Sun, The Documentation Centre of the University of Guelph Library.
5. John Black, Statement to Ontario Resources and Technical Services Group.

Piercy, E.J. "Government Documents in the Enoch Pratt Library," Serial Slants, VII (January 1956) 25-35.

Piggot, M. "Cataloguing of Government Publications," Library Association Record, LVIII (1956) 129-135.

Saville, Mahala. "Government Publications - What Shall We Do With Them?" Library Journal, LXV (1940) 681-684.

Schmeckebier, Laurence F. and Eastin, Roy B. Government Publications and their Use. Rev. ed. Washington: Brookings Institute, 1961.

Schultz, J.E. Summary Report of Government Documents Questionnaire. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Library, 1965. (Processed)

Shaw, T.S. "Federal, State, and Local Government Publications," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 3-19.

Shaw, T. "Government Documents: Part I, Problems in Acquisition," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, XXX (Winter 1968) 181-184.

Shaw, T. "Government Documents: Part II, Arrangement," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, XXXI (Spring 1968) 21-54.

Sims, E.M. "Selection and Reference Use [of Government Publications] in the College and University Library," Library Trends, XV (July 1966) 107-116.

Turnbull, Mildred I. "The Acquisition of Canadian Government Documents," Special Libraries, (November 1952) 341-343.

Ward, Pauline. "Processing Government Documents," College and Research Libraries, (January 1951) 48-51.

Wilcox, J.K. "A Documents Division in World War II," College and Research Libraries, VI (March 1945) 108-111.